

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, March 29, 2004 at 5:30 p.m., with Councilor President Fitch presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Councilors Fitch, Ballew, Ralston, and Woodrow. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Mayor Leiken and Councilor Lundberg were absent.

City Manager Mike Kelly said there was only one item on the council agenda this evening regarding proposed resources for the FY05 Budget. Staff has met with council leadership on two occasions to discuss this issue. Council can take as much or as little time as they need to discuss this topic.

1. Proposed Resources for the FY05 Budget.

Finance Director Bob Duey presented the staff report on this item. Mr. Duey said tonight's work session is in response to the consensus direction provided by the Budget Committee on January 27, 2003. He said each year staff has tried to bring a balance of revenues and expenditures to the Budget Committee in late April. Based upon final council direction, staff will finalize budget recommendations regarding the level and type of service reductions.

Staff has met with council on two occasions this year to discuss budget issues. The first meeting was during Council's Goal Setting Session on November 24, 2003 and the second meeting was with council and the Budget Committee in January 2004. Direction was given at these meetings that has assisted staff in creating some options. The Budget Committee expressed that there would not be a focused cut that would balance the budget, but rather a combination of one-time revenues, ongoing revenues and expenditure reductions. The Executive Team has been working on expenditure reductions and is ready to move in that direction if that is council's desire. Before staff finalizes the budget, they wanted council to see some possibilities of revenue sources. This would help staff be better prepared with a proposed budget to bring to the Budget Committee.

Mr. Duey referred to charts he distributed to council which show our situation and how we got there. The first chart showed the different revenue sources that have come into the General Fund over the last ten years. He explained each source and the reason for increases and decreases from each source. He discussed Enterprise Funds and other separate funds which are self-sustainable. Those things left in the General Fund are not very sustainable.

The second chart showed the full time employee (FTE) growth as it related to the population growth during the same period. Mr. Duey discussed the process of increasing FTE as the population grows.

Councilor Fitch asked how many funds have been transferred from General Fund to All Funds.

Mr. Duey said less than a half a dozen have moved from the General Fund to Specialty Funds as part of the reduction. Sometimes, if a fund is no longer self-sustainable, it goes back into the General Fund.

Councilor Ballew asked if the large increase in All Funds was related to fire personnel.

Mr. Duey said the police officers and the fire fighters are not in the General Fund, but are in the Levy Fund. The way the Levy Funds are set up, they are specialty funds.

Mr. Duey referred to the chart which showed the Operating Transfers which have come out of other funds into the General Fund. The most common transfers are from the Bancroft Fund, about \$300,000 per year; the Booth Kelly Fund, about \$200,000 per year; and the Transient Room Tax, about \$300,000 per year. Those funds were meant for this level of transfer. Over the last two years, however, these funds, plus other specialty funds have been used at a higher rate to balance the General Fund. Expenditures have also been cut, but revenues as ongoing revenue have not been increasing much over the last couple of years. Ongoing revenues have not been addressed over the last few years other than normal increases due to inflation, etc. No new revenue sources have been implemented. Tonight, staff will propose some new ongoing revenues and one-time revenues for the upcoming year.

Councilor Ralston asked if the large transfers that took place in FY03 and FY04 depleted any specialty funds.

Mr. Duey said they have not depleted any funds to the point where it is harmful, but no more could be taken. He gave some examples.

Councilor Ralston asked how much money is left in the specialty funds.

Mr. Duey said there is about \$1.7M left. The Bancroft Fund is maintaining because the interest has been spent and not the principal. The Bancroft Fund is holding at about \$3M. The only reserves that could afford transfers are the Booth Kelly Fund and the Bancroft Fund. The Booth Kelly Fund is questionable, however, because of other improvements scheduled for those funds.

Mr. Duey referred to a chart handed out to councilors which outlined the FY05-06 Budget Deficits. Staff is looking for direction for the next two years. He discussed the reductions staff has been able to come up with that do not require council action. The FY06 deficit will be determined by council's direction for the FY05 budget. The items in the General Fund do not generate a lot of revenue, so the deficit grows. He discussed the growth in expenditures each year. Revenues grow at a rate of about 2.5 percent and expenditures grow at a rate of about 6.2

percent. Part of the growth includes the labor contracts which are already in place, cost of living increases, PERS increases, and health insurance costs. Most of the budget is personal services.

Councilor Ballew asked if the \$1.4 Million deficit for FY06 related to the difference in the expected revenue and expected expenditures.

Mr. Duey said that was correct. Unless the structure is changed, this gap will continue to grow. There are ways to address this issue.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the numbers on the FY05-FY06 Budget Deficits Chart reflect any of the proposed options.

Mr. Duey said the \$500,000 in the first column is the starting point for tonight's discussion. The proposed revenue sources to be discussed at tonight's work session would be an improvement on that figure.

Mr. Kelly said the expected use of one-time money from the Booth Kelly Fund and the Bancroft Fund has already been figured into that amount. He said the additional \$500,000 left would need to be made up either by reductions, revenues or more one-time money.

Councilor Fitch asked if the funds that are moved out of the General Fund into specialty funds are charged indirects.

Mr. Duey said that is correct. He used the Building Permit Fund as an example. When a fund becomes a specialty fund, it then needs to pay for rent, utilities, data processing charges, etc. There can be some benefit to the General Fund when some of those funds move into their own fund.

Councilor Fitch asked if that affected the cost recovery figures the Development Task Force looked at regarding planning fees.

Mr. Duey said it did not affect it because it is a different fund.

Councilor Ballew asked Mr. Duey to explain indirects.

Mr. Duey said indirects is a way to pay for internal services. Those include the City Manager's Office, City Attorney's Office, Information Technology, Finance and Human Resources. He explained how each of those indirects is calculated and charged to the Enterprise Funds.

Mr. Duey referred to the chart showing possible expenditure reductions without using additional revenues.

Mr. Kelly said there is a \$1.4M deficit expected over the next two years. Addressing the \$1.4M in reductions this year, there would not be a problem for the following year. He explained the options of how this could be accomplished and how it would work for the short-term or long-term. Staff is suggesting three revenue sources to look at over the next year. Based on council

response, staff would fill in the right mix of one-time money or cuts. These revenue sources are only a few of the possibilities. Even if all three revenues are accepted tonight, cuts would need to be made in the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars over the next year.

Mr. Duey referred to other revenue options listed on the document given to council. He discussed the options that are Not Under Consideration due to state issues and laws. Also noted on this document are three options listed under Future Considerations. Those three include 1) Urban Renewal District, 2) Merger with Willakenzie Fire Protection District and 3) Business Registration or Licensing Program. Mr. Duey said the Urban Renewal District is not a revenue proposal for the General Fund, but would affect taxes. The merger with the Willakenzie Fire Protection District is still a possibility and continues to be discussed for future consideration. The business registration and licensing program is listed as a topic of future consideration because it could be a revenue source in the future. The city may want to begin coordinating our business services better in preparation for such a program. None of these items are being recommended for the FY05 Budget year.

Councilor Ballew said as Springfield grows, our sophistication regarding who is doing business in the city needs to increase. To that end, charging a nominal fee for businesses to register would be helpful to public safety, land use and other housekeeping items. She would support starting that process.

Councilor Ralston said the cost of initiating a program like that could be as much or more than what gets collected. It is not a revenue consideration.

Councilor Ballew said over time it may become revenue generating.

Councilor Ralston said it could be difficult for small businesses to have to pay a business license and may influence new companies that want to move here.

Councilor Woodrow said it may give the city more control over the businesses that come into the city.

Councilor Fitch said Councilor Lundberg relayed to her that she would be in favor of a business registration, knowing as a small business owner, she would also be paying that fee. It would be beneficial in gathering information. She cautioned that the city collect enough to make the program at least cost neutral.

Mr. Duey said at the top of the document is a list of options under Current Consideration. These are new programs. He discussed each of these options which included: 1) Additional Use of One-Time Operating Transfers; 2) Capital Bond Issue; 3) Special Serial Levy; and 4) Utility Tax.

Staff is requesting that the council review and provide direction this evening on three other revenue items that are under consideration for inclusion in next year's proposed budget. These three items remain under consideration as ones that staff believes either fits with the council's previous direction for cost recovery or have the opportunity to help stabilize the services within the city's General Fund. The three fees on the agenda for this evening are:

<u>Authority/Reference</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>
* Development Code		
• Planning Fees	Cost Recovery	\$204,090 - \$838,069
* Miscellaneous Fees		
• Ambulance User Fees	Cost Recovery	\$171,780 - \$452,656
* Municipal Code		
• Utility Tax	Two-year stabilization of services	\$150,000 - \$250,000

The council has as one of its top five-year goals to “provide financially sound, stable city government”. Springfield, as are most municipalities in Oregon, is finding this difficult to accomplish for its General Fund activities in a time when there are several factors working against that goal. Changes made through tax limitation measures, a slowed down federal and state economy, significant revenues that are slow growth, public safety binding arbitration, unmet existing service priorities, and a back log of capital and maintenance needs are all factors that need to be addressed while attempting to provide stability to the city’s financial plan.

Mr. Duey introduced Development Services Department (DSD) Director Bill Grile and Planning Supervisor Mel Oberst.

Mr. Grile gave the staff report on Cost Recovery of the Land Development Review Program. He said one of the concepts DSD has been looking at in overhauling their fees is how to make it more equitable for the smaller developer. Over the years, the fees have indexed up and the smaller developer has been hurt disproportionately to larger developers in the issuance of permit approval. Mr. Grile had asked Mr. Oberst to hold small business owners’ permits harmless or roll them back and to look at increasing cost recovery from thirty-five percent to some percentage above that for larger developers. Staff consulted with the HomeBuilder’s Association and the Developer’s Task Force and both are comfortable with the fifty percent cost recovery which would generate another \$200,000 above current amounts collected. Mr. Grile commended Mr. Oberst for his work on this and his process for these fees.

Councilor Ballew said she is concerned about equity. Creating a fee based on who is paying for it may seem to be inequitable. Basing it on the work done is a better approach.

Mr. Grile said one of the equity issues staff had was the former plan that was in place. He discussed increasing the cost according to work done. He referred to the charts created by Mr. Oberst regarding subdivision lots which showed how these new proposals are more equitable. In the past the smaller developers were in a sense subsidizing the larger developers. He discussed a suggestion from Roxie Cuellar of the HomeBuilder’s Association (HBA) and how they implemented that into this new fee schedule.

Councilor Ballew said she agrees with the process, but not the language which states holding the smaller developer harmless.

Councilor Woodrow asked if there was a structure that could be applied that would be equitable for everyone.

Mr. Grile referred to an analysis done by Senior Management Analyst Bob Brew which showed the amount of labor that goes into processing permits. Staff has used his figures to calculate these fees structures. There are a number of ways to calculate fees and any of them could be criticized. What matters is what council feels comfortable with and how staff could achieve the equity the community deserves.

Councilor Fitch said the question is what is the philosophy of this council?

Councilor Woodrow said he is disappointed because council had asked for a hundred percent cost recovery and the numbers still don't bear this out. There must be a more fair method of applying the costs so we could still collect the fifty percent without driving out the development.

Mr. Grile said staff has worked on this and tried to accomplish this type of equity.

Councilor Ralston said in all the revenue alternatives being presented tonight, he would not support a utility tax. He has been a strong proponent of one hundred percent recovery. He would support collecting a higher percentage of the cost rather than using something like a utility tax. He would support seventy five percent recovery.

Councilor Ballew discussed efficiency and staffs work on that. She said fees should cover the cost, but not drive off people who want to develop in the city. She would support starting at fifty percent recovery and working our way up to one hundred percent.

Councilor Ralston asked if we could look at incremental increases, one year at a time.

Councilor Ballew agreed. She would like to have this brought back to council each year.

Mr. Grile said one of the things staff hopes to do in becoming more efficient is to hold the revenues without adding staff.

Councilor Woodrow asked staff to confirm the math to be sure it is fifty percent recovery.

Councilor Fitch asked if staff pursued higher cost recovery when they met with the HBA and the Developer's Task Force.

Mr. Grile said staff did show them the higher figures and HBA and the Developer's Task Force did not totally oppose these higher numbers.

Councilor Fitch said council seems to be in agreement to go to fifty percent. She suggested maintaining a commitment to this process and keeping the two groups involved as staff becomes more efficient in the process. The reality is that these fees need to move to one hundred percent in the future.

Mr. Kelly said past councilors have discussed this topic in previous years. There is the issue of the fees that are set as a revenue source and what percentage of the costs should be recovered.

That issue gets into the budget situation and council's philosophy about public service. There is the issue of whether or not the fees interfere with economic and social goals. Another component past councilor have discussed is the nature of a fee and how it directly benefits the consumer. He discussed direct benefits and benefit for the public. Past councils have asked: 1) is this a revenue issue; 2) is it cost competitive; or 3) which costs accrue directly to the current person on the other side of the counter and which costs accrue to the public at large.

Councilor Woodrow said it is also important to realize that all citizens should not have to pay fees for improvement to one home or to a development. As we recoup the fees, we relieve the tax burden on the rest of the citizens and place it into the developers' cost of goods.

Mr. Kelly said past councilors have looked at these issues.

Councilor Fitch said fifty percent is a starting place. It is a policy decision to look at in years to come. Council would like to look at additional increases in future years, as well as staff working on better and more efficient ways of processing. In the past, Springfield has had a history of service and a can-do attitude. It's important not to lose that in the process.

Mr. Grile said staff has been working hard on improving the efficiencies and have heard good feedback from builders.

Deputy Chief John Garitz presented the staff report on the Amendment to the Fee Schedule of Ambulance and Emergency Medical Services (EMS). He discussed the Council Briefing Memo included in the agenda packet. Mr. Garitz said this issue does not affect the General Fund directly, but rather the EMS Fund. It could indirectly affect the General Fund by stabilizing the EMS Fund, which would lessen any possible impact on the General Fund. He discussed some of the highlights of this issue. Ambulance rates are reviewed on an annual basis to make sure they are sufficient enough to support EMS operations. The proposal tonight is for an overall 10.3 percent increase in the average account value. That is a weighted average of all the charges as charged per patient. This increase would generate about \$452,000 in additional billings and about \$172,000 for actual collection. He discussed the issues related to collection with regards to Medicare/Medicaid and other government agencies that mandate what they can and cannot collect on behalf of the beneficiary. This rate proposal would put Springfield in the upper mid-range related to similar providers across the state. At this point, staff is not recommending increases to the FireMed membership fee, but will maintain that at \$45 for the next annual campaign. Staff will be coming to council on April 26 to provide additional information on the overall health of the EMS Program and Fund. At that time, staff will be making some recommendations to council for further study. He asked councilors to let him know if they have input on items they would like addressed at that time.

Councilor Ralston asked how many people belonged to FireMed.

Mr. Garitz said about 32,000 covered lives which equal about 18,000 memberships.

Councilor Ralston said he is for cost recovery and assumes the large increase is due to the number of billings that cannot be collected. He feels everyone should be a member of FireMed. He asked why our costs were so much higher than in other cities.

Mr. Garitz said it is difficult to compare because he does not know the cost basis of the other cities and how much they are trying to recover.

Councilor Ballew asked about the base rate of \$7.95. She asked if we had 100 percent collection if that would cover the cost. She feels that \$7.95 may be too low.

Mr. Garitz said she could be correct. He would like to hear from council what cost basis they would like to recover and what expenses should be allocated to the EMS Fund. He would like to make a proposal that the city bring in an outside consultant to conduct an intense study regarding those costs.

Councilor Ballew said she approves of the increased fees proposed.

Councilor Woodrow asked how much they would need to use from their reserves based on these increases.

Mr. Garitz said at this time they would need approximately \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Councilor Woodrow asked why raising the FireMed cost to \$55 a year has not been considered, taking into account what is provided through FireMed.

Mr. Garitz said the philosophy in the past has been to maintain the cost in this first year without Eugene. That is an area they plan to look at in the future. He discussed the impact of such an increase.

Councilor Woodrow said for the benefit people receive, even \$55 is a great insurance. He does not want to hurt those people on fixed incomes, but we need to do what we can. It is a voluntary program.

Mr. Garitz said there is a sensitivity to cost because many of the citizens the EMS Department hears from are those on fixed incomes and have concerns about saving up for the current rate.

Councilor Woodrow suggested a discount for those over age sixty-five.

Councilor Fitch asked what percentage of calls for ambulance service was outside city limits.

Mr. Garitz said about 67 percent were within the city and 33 percent were outside city limits in calendar year 2002.

Councilor Fitch asked how many of the 33 percent were Medicare or Medicaid.

Mr. Garitz said he does not have that information, but he could make the estimate that of those 2200 patients that were picked up outside city limits, 34 percent were Medicare.

Councilor Fitch asked if the fire engine responds to those calls outside city limits.

Mr. Garitz said the fire engine does not respond to outside calls, just the ambulance. The engine that would respond would be part of the local fire district that serves that area.

Councilor Fitch asked if we are recouping the costs of responding to the calls outside of city limits. She asked if the mileage was sufficient with the base rate to recoup what we need or are we losing money on these calls.

Mr. Garitz said it is difficult to segregate it in those terms. Making calls outside the city limits has not required additional staff to be hired. It has been advantageous, but has not been examined for a while.

Mr. Kelly said that information could be gathered for the April 26 council meeting. He recapped Councilor Fitch's question.

Councilor Ralston said citizens within the city pay into the system for fire and life services. Calls outside the area could be at a different rate other than mileage only.

Councilor Ballew said there is an unreimbursed area.

Mr. Kelly said staff would look to get this information. The city is chartered for an ambulance service area along with Eugene. Even if after looking at the figures, the city cannot stop providing the services.

Councilor Fitch said she would like this information to make sure the cost recovery is adequate.

Councilor Ballew asked if anyone had questioned ambulance service legislatively.

Mr. Garitz said ambulance service areas are their own entity. The Lane County Commissioners determine the ambulance service areas.

Councilor Fitch said Councilor Lundberg did not disagree with increases.

Councilor Fitch said council consensus was to move forward on this, but to bring back more information regarding cost recovery in the outside areas.

Councilor Woodrow asked when the last time the FireMed fees were increased.

Mr. Garitz said FireMed rates were last increased in 2002, and user rates were increased in January 2003.

Technical Services Manager Len Goodwin presented the staff report on the proposed Utility Tax. He referred to the memorandum included in the council agenda packet. He said this proposal takes a structural look at one of the city's principal general revenue strengths, which is now the franchise revenue which brings in approximately \$1M a year in General Fund revenue. He referred to Mr. Duey's comment that there is a lack of truly economically sensitive revenue source. Property taxes are no longer economically sensitive. In the past, franchise fees were economically sensitive, but that is changing. Mr. Goodwin said the political environment and the technical environment have removed the sensitivity in franchise fees to economic activity.

Mr. Goodwin said as technology and the legal environment changes, franchise fees are no longer affected by economic trends. He gave examples of the technological changes that have affected franchise fees. As a result the city's revenue has stagnated over the last four or five years. That is the context of this issue. The reasons that our franchise is no longer economically sensitive also put the entire structure at risk. He discussed the current litigation regarding this issue. The courts have sided with Springfield and other cities involved in this case, but the decision from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has not been given. If the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals sides with the cities, it will go to the U.S. Supreme Court. Other litigations surrounding these fees have not been successful due to state laws being changed in some of the states. Even if Springfield wins the litigation, the reality is that those types of fees are going away. Oregon will most likely move to the approach of taxation as a way of collecting from those companies that are doing this sort of business in our state. He discussed current bills going to Congress regarding these fees and the transfer of information to citizens.

Mr. Goodwin said cities can tax businesses for the privilege of engaging in that business activity; therefore, now may be the time to step away from the franchise fee and look at this other way to recover costs of city services and facilities. Staff has prepared this proposal and drafted an ordinance to accomplish this tax. Mr. Goodwin said this does not supplant existing franchises. This ordinance would impose a tax of five percent on gross revenues of any company doing utility business in Springfield, with a one hundred percent credit for any company who currently has a franchise and is paying a franchise fee to the city. He discussed the limits set by the state and how this could be adjusted.

This utility tax could produce additional revenue for things such as high speed data, calls generated from wireless servers, and companies that offer long distance. This proposal is a different direction from franchise fees. It is designed to get a structural balance back into the approach for revenue generation for this sort of activity because of technological change and developments both from the legislature and the courts.

Councilor Ballew asked Mr. Goodwin to define franchise fee compared to tax.

Mr. Goodwin said a franchise is viewed as a fee. In Springfield's case, it is rent for the right-of-way for their wire and pipes. A tax is based on the revenue of a business.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the taxes get passed onto the consumer.

Mr. Goodwin said they do, as do franchise fees. In some cases, the franchise fee is built into the base and spread across all the company's utility customers.

Councilor Ralston clarified that when Mr. Goodwin discussed collecting \$1M a year, he intended to say \$1.5M, as noted on page D-3 of Attachment D, included in the agenda packet.

Councilor Ralston asked who changed the laws in the states Mr. Goodwin mentioned. He asked if it was a vote of the people.

Mr. Goodwin said as far as he knows it was legislative action.

Councilor Ralston asked why DSL cable was not considered in this category.

Mr. Goodwin said Springfield believes cable modems should be included, but Comcast feels they should not. Comcast is relying on an interpretative, declaratory ruling by the Federal Communication Commission last year which stated cable modem service is not a cable service within the meaning of Title VI of the Communications Act of 1934, but rather an information service within the meaning of Title II. Title VI is what governs the franchise fee. The fact that it is a declaratory ruling and not a final judgment did not deter Comcast from stopping payment. DSL is a functional equivalent offered by companies such as Qwest or other telecom providers. It is not included because it is not a local exchange service. DSL revenue is accounted for differently and is not a local exchange within the meaning of state law.

Councilor Ralston referred to page D-9, Attachment D included in the agenda packet. He asked about the revenue potential of Telecom Tax and Utility Tax.

Mr. Goodwin said the chart shows the potential with or without charges to SUB Electric, SUB Water and City Sewer/Drainage. He explained the difference between the Telecom Tax and the Utility Tax.

Councilor Ralston said he believes citizens would not look at this in a favorable light. He has never been a proponent of a utility tax.

Councilor Woodrow confirmed that SUB pays an in lieu of tax for electric utilities, but not on the water. He asked how much they pay.

Mr. Goodwin said they pay \$1,650,000 in lieu of property taxes.

Councilor Woodrow asked how much it would cost the city if we were to lose the Qwest lawsuit at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Goodwin said the city receives about \$380,000 - \$400,000 a year from Qwest alone and we would lose that revenue unless there was a utility tax. Northwest Natural pays a franchise fee of five percent.

Councilor Woodrow said if we lose franchise fees, which the citizens are already paying for, and the math was done correctly for those already paying the franchise fee, there would be no increase to those consumers. There would be increases in other services such as the data lines and DSL rights. He would not support charging SUB electric and sewer and drainage because citizens are already paying for that.

Councilor Ballew said Mr. Goodwin has presented a compelling case to move over to the taxing system rather than the franchise system. She has some concern of being able to tax and not feeling solid on this issue. As a city, to provide services, we need revenues. The city no longer sets a tax rate and to continue to serve people, we need to use the tools we can to support the service.

Councilor Ralston said he does not like the term tax associated with this item. However, if the city lost the Qwest lawsuit, we should replace it with something else. He would like to wait.

Councilor Fitch said Councilor Lundberg was opposed to this tax. Councilor Fitch understood that Councilors Woodrow and Ballew approve implementing this tax without including SUB and Sewer. Councilor Fitch said she agrees and would give approval, but it is critical how this is put together. SUB and sewer should not be included. She said staging it for those already being charged a franchise fee is a good plan.

Mr. Goodwin said for over a century Oregon has relied on the concept of renting its right-of-way, as have most states in this country. It is difficult to back away from that concept. The reality is outstripping our ability to compete in this environment.

Councilor Ballew confirmed that the city would continue to control access of right-of-way.

Councilor Fitch gave a brief summary of council's direction regarding the three proposals: 1) Cost Recovery of the Land Development Review Program – yes; 2) Amendment to the Fee Schedule of Ambulance and Emergency Medical Services – yes; 3) Utility Tax – minor majority yes.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

